

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/805,770	Applicant(s) DURR ET AL.	
	Examiner ALEXA D. NECKEL	Art Unit 1795	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) ALEXA D. NECKEL. (3) Kevin McKinley.

(2) Shannon Gardner. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 18 June 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the differences between Chone and the instant invention. The examiners suggested that applicant clarify the claim language of claim 1 to state that the first layer only contains one size of particle. Such an amendment would overcome the Chone 102 rejection. The examiners did indicate that applicants should review the Usami reference as it may be applicable even with the amendment.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.